

Appl. No. : 09/877,632  
Filed : June 8, 2001

### REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the July 31, 2006 Office Action. Claims 1 and 23 are amended and Claims 2-22 and 24-27 remain as originally filed. Thus, Claims 1-27 are presented for further consideration. Please enter the amendments and reconsider the claims in view of the following remarks.

#### **Response to Objection to Claim 1**

In the July 31, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claim 1 for insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended Claim 1, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to Claim 1.

#### **Response to Rejection of Claims 1-14 and 16-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

In the July 31, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-14 and 16-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,868,225 issued to Brown et al. ("Brown").

##### Claim 1

Claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

1. An audiovisual system which receives audiovisual data and which stores for later playback at least a portion of the audiovisual data comprising a plurality of program locations, each program location representing a starting point of a program segment of one of a plurality of programs, the audiovisual system connectable to a user display, the audiovisual system comprising:

a system controller;

a storage device to store the portion of the audiovisual data and to play back the stored portion of the audiovisual data;

a marking module coupled to the system controller to create metadata in response to a control input for marking the program segments, the metadata comprising information regarding the program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data;

a display generator coupled to the system controller to generate a **mosaic representation of the program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data**; and

a program selector coupled to the system controller to select a program segment of the stored portion of the audiovisual data in response to a user input, the selected program segment selected based on the information of the metadata, whereby the audiovisual system selectively plays back selected program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data starting from selected program locations, thereby enabling a user to jump to and play back selected program segments of the plurality of programs.

**Appl. No.** : 09/877,632  
**Filed** : June 8, 2001

Applicant submits that Brown does not disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. For example, Brown does not disclose a display generator that generates “a mosaic representation of the program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data,” as recited by Claim 1.

The present application at page 5, lines 5-9 explains that in certain embodiments, “sequential viewing of short content within multiple lengthy videos [is made] effective and convenient” by allowing “a user to quickly mark, locate, or view video segments from multiple videos using a graphical-user interface with a mosaic representation.” Furthermore, in certain embodiments, the mosaic representation comprises “a plurality of cells” (*e.g.*, fixed images or video images) in a grid format. (Present application at page 14, lines 5-9 and Figures 8 and 9A-9D.)

Brown discloses a multimedia program bookmarking system in which “allows the user to bookmark a program where he left off.” (Brown at column 15, lines 29-31.) Brown at column 20, lines 8-12 discloses that these bookmarks can be displayed while a program is playing “over the trick play bar” as vertical bars that give the user visual cues that a bookmark exists in that position of the program. Brown at column 20, lines 12-13 also discloses that the user can sequentially jump to each bookmark within a program currently being viewed by pressing a jump button on the remote control.

Applicant submits that the sequentially-accessed bookmarks displayed as vertical bars on a trick play bar are not “a mosaic representation of the program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data” as recited by Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that Brown does not disclose all the limitations of Claim 1, so Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Brown. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and pass Claim 1 to allowance.

#### Claims 2-13

Each of Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-13 depends from Claim 1, Claim 5 depends from Claim 4, and Claim 10 depends from Claim 9. Therefore, each of Claims 2-13 includes all the limitations of Claim 1 as well as other limitations of particular utility, so Claims 2-13 are patentably distinguished over Brown. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 2-13 and pass these claims to allowance.

Claim 14

Claim 14 recites (emphasis added):

14. An audiovisual system which receives audiovisual data and which stores for later playback at least a portion of the audiovisual data comprising a plurality of program locations, each program location representing a starting point of a program segment of one of a plurality of programs, the audiovisual system connectable to a user display which provides to a user information regarding the program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data, the audiovisual system comprising:

a storage device to store the portion of the audiovisual data and to play back the stored portion of the audiovisual data;

**a grid generator to configure for the user display the information regarding the program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data, the information derived from metadata corresponding to the program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data, the information provided to the user via the user display in grid format with a plurality of grid elements, each grid element representing a program segment of the stored portion of the audiovisual data; and**

a program selector to select a grid element that represents a selected program segment of the stored portion of the audiovisual data in response to user input, the selected program segment selected based on the information derived from the metadata, whereby the audiovisual system selectively plays back selected program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data starting from selected program locations, thereby enabling a user to jump to and play back selected program segments of the plurality of programs.

Applicant submits that Brown does not disclose all the limitations of Claim 14. For example, Brown does not disclose “a grid generator to configure ... the information regarding the program segments of the stored portion of the audiovisual data, ... the information provided to the user ... in grid format with a plurality of grid elements,” as recited by Claim 14.

The Examiner cites Brown at column 21, lines 23-29 and 46-48 as disclosing the grid generator recited by Claim 14. However, these portions of Brown disclose “a program guide area ... which is a list of the programs that are currently airing, was aired, or is scheduled on live TV” and that it presents a schedule of “what is on live TV now, what is on all channels, and what is on a particular channel that is coming up.” Thus, Brown only discloses that this program guide area includes information regarding the schedule of live TV broadcasts, and does not disclose that the program guide area includes “information regarding the program segments of the **stored portion of the audiovisual data, ... the information provided to the user via the user display in**

Appl. No. : 09/877,632  
Filed : June 8, 2001

**grid format with a plurality of grid elements”** as recited by Claim 14 (emphasis added). Therefore, Applicant submits that Brown does not disclose all the limitations of Claim 14. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 14 and pass Claim 14 to allowance.

Claims 16-22

Each of Claims 16-22 depends from Claim 14, so each of Claims 16-22 includes all the limitations of Claim 14 as well as other limitations of particular utility. Therefore, Claims 16-22 are patentably distinguished over Brown, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 16-22 and pass these claims to allowance.

Claim 23

Applicant has amended Claim 23 to recite (emphasis added):

23. A method of playing back selected portions of stored audiovisual data stored on a storage device, the method comprising:
- providing stored audiovisual data corresponding to a plurality of programs, each program comprising a plurality of program locations, each program location representing a starting point of a program segment of one of the plurality of programs;
  - creating metadata in response to a control input for marking the program segments, the metadata comprising information regarding the program segments of the stored audiovisual data;
  - displaying to a user the information regarding the program segments of the stored audiovisual data in a mosaic representation;**
  - receiving a user input indicating a selected program segment of one of the plurality of programs, the selected program segment selected based on the information of the metadata; and
  - playing back the selected program segment starting from the corresponding program location of the stored audiovisual data, thereby jumping to and playing back selected program segments of the plurality of programs based on the metadata.

For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claim 1, Applicant submits that Brown does not disclose “displaying to a user the information regarding the program segments of the stored audiovisual data in a mosaic representation,” as recited by amended Claim 23. Therefore, Applicant submits that Brown does not disclose all the limitations of amended Claim 23. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 23 and pass Claim 23 to allowance.

Appl. No. : 09/877,632  
Filed : June 8, 2001

Claims 24-27

Each of Claims 24-26 depends from amended Claim 23, and Claim 27 depends from Claim 26, so each of Claims 24-27 includes all the limitations of amended Claim 23 as well as other limitations of particular utility. Therefore, Claims 24-27 are patentably distinguished over Brown, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 24-27 and pass these claims to allowance.

**Response to Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the July 31, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,241 issued to Yuen et al. ("Yuen"). Applicant submits that Yuen does not disclose or suggest the limitations of Claim 14 which are not disclosed or suggested by Brown. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 14 is patentably distinguished over the combination of Brown and Yuen.

Claim 15 depends from Claim 14, so Claim 15 includes all the limitations of Claim 14 as well as other limitations of particular utility. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 15 is patentably distinguished over the combination of Brown and Yuen, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 15 and pass Claim 15 to allowance.

**Summary**


For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests such action.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/20/06

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Bruce S. Itchkawitz  
Registration No. 47,677  
Attorney of Record

3019342  
101506